

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/848,269	05/04/2001	Marina N. Papuashvili	123358.100	6313	
21269	7590 01/10/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP			SALVOZA, M FRANCO G		
	ON CENTER, 50TH FLOO	R	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
500 GRANT			ARTORIT	TATER NUMBER	
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			1648		

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/848,269	PAPUASHVILI, MARINA N.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		M. Franco Salvoza	1648				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATU WHICHEVER IS LONG - Extensions of time may be ava after SIX (6) MONTHS from the - If NO period for reply is specification - Failure to reply within the set of	ER, FROM THE MAILING Dailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 a mailing date of this communication. But above, the maximum statutory period or extended period for reply will, by statute a later than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro c, cause the application to become ABANDON g date of this communication, even if timely fi	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a) ☐ This action is FIN 3) ☐ Since this applica	tion is in condition for allowa	pril 2005. action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,					
Disposition of Claims							
4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is 6) ☐ Claim(s) is 7) ☐ Claim(s) is 8) ☒ Claim(s) 9-16 are Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification 10) ☐ The drawing(s) file Applicant may not a Replacement draw	s/are rejected. s/are objected to. subject to restriction and/or sobjected to by the Examine ed on is/are: a) acc request that any objection to the ing sheet(s) including the correct	from consideration. election requirement.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119						
12) Acknowledgment a) All b) Some 1. Certified co 2. Certified co 3. Copies of t application	is made of a claim for foreign e * c) None of: opies of the priority document opies of the priority document the certified copies of the prior from the International Burea	ts have been received in Applications in the second in the	ation No ived in this National Stage				
	atent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

1. The examiner of your application has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1648, Examiner Salvoza.

2. After review of the previous Action, it was determined that upon further consideration that further restriction is appropriate for a thorough and complete examination. The Office regrets any inconvenience. The restriction set forth below replaces the previous one.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, drawn to an anti-hepatitis virus agent, classified in class 536, subclass 22.1.
- II. Claims 15, 16 drawn to a method for treating hepatitis, classified in class 424, subclass 278.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case an anti-hepatitis agent comprising a nucleotide sequence directing synthesis can be used in materially different processes such as expressing the toxin to raise antibodies or test diagnostic materials.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Species Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Once one of the Groups is chosen, election of one of the species of Hepatitis virus (B, C, D or E) is required since the different forms of Hepatitis are separate viruses having distinct functions, distinct structures, and distinct physical, chemical and functional properties requiring separate searches of the prior art.

Further election of one of the toxins (diphtheria exotoxin, diphtheria exotoxin A-subunit, Shigella toxin, Disenteria toxin) is required since the different toxins are different products with patentably distinct structures and properties requiring separate searches of the prior art.

In addition, one of the regulatory regions must be elected (Shine Delgarno sequence or the IRBS) since the two regulatory regions are separate products with patentably distinct structures and properties requiring separate searches of the prior art.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Application/Control Number: 09/848,269

Art Unit: 1648

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product

Application/Control Number: 09/848,269

Art Unit: 1648

Page 5

claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Franco Salvoza whose telephone number is (571) 272-8410. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on (571) 272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Franco Salvoza

Patent Examiner

Techniques (Line 1 100)